

Boyd, Pete, Harris, Kim and Murray, Jean (2007) Becoming a teacher educator: guidelines for the induction of newly appointed lecturers in initial teacher education. n/a . pp. 1-28.

Downloaded from: <http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/365/>

Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria's institutional repository 'Insight' must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria's institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available [here](#)) for educational and not-for-profit activities

provided that

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
- a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator's reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found [here](#).

Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing insight@cumbria.ac.uk.

Becoming a Teacher Educator:

Guidelines for the induction of newly appointed lecturers in Initial Teacher Education



Peter Boyd,
Kim Harris &
Jean Murray

The
Higher
Education
Academy

**Subject
Centre for
Education
ESCalate**

The Authors

Peter Boyd is a Senior Lecturer in the Centre for Development of Learning and Teaching at St. Martin's College. His background is in secondary school teaching and initial teacher education both as a school-based mentor and as a lecturer in higher education. Peter's current work includes academic development and his research interests include assessment in higher education, peer observation of teaching, and professional development of academic staff.

Jean Murray teaches on doctoral, masters and pre-service teacher education courses at Brunel University in the west of London. Building on her background in schooling and higher education, her research interests focus on exploring the academic and professional identities of teacher educators, and their induction and career development within the higher education sector.

Kim Harris is a Senior Lecturer in the Education Faculty at St. Martin's College. Her background is in primary school teaching and initial teacher education. Kim is a specialist in primary music education.

Published by


Higher Education Academy
Education Subject Centre
ESCalate
University of Bristol
Graduate School of Education
35 Berkeley Square
Clifton
Bristol
BS8 1JA
Email: heacademy-escalate@bristol.ac.uk
www.escalate.ac.uk

© ESCalate Spring 2007

Permission is granted to copy and distribute this document in unaltered form only, for the purpose of teaching, research, private study, criticism and review, provided that the original author and publisher is acknowledged.

Becoming a Teacher Educator:
Guidelines for the induction of newly appointed lecturers
in Initial Teacher Education

By Peter Boyd, Kim Harris & Jean Murray



Thanks to the many colleagues who have contributed to the development of these guidelines through participation in workshops or by commenting on drafts including:

Linda Amrane-Cooper	Anglia Ruskin University
Suzanne Bailey	University of Greenwich
Yvonne Barnes	Liverpool Hope University
Mike Blamires	Canterbury Christ Church University
Verna Brandford	Institute of Education, University of London
Caroline Brennan	University of East London
Martin Bridge	St. Mary's University College, Twickenham
Emma Brown	Central School of Speech and Drama
Peter Carr	UCE Birmingham
John Clossick	Lifelong Learning UK
Helen Conder	Canterbury Christ Church University
Helen Cook	Sheffield Hallam University
Christopher Dalladay	University of East London
Roger Dalrymple	Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College
Jon Davison	Canterbury Christ Church University
Pat Drake	University of Sussex
Eddie Ellis	Middlesex University
Sue Field	Canterbury Christ Church University
Su Garlick	University of East London
Jennifer Harrison	University of Leicester
Joan Hendy	Birmingham College of Food, Tourism and Creative Studies
Neil Herrington	University of East London
Felicity Hilditch	University of Greenwich
Barbara Hooker	University of Wolverhampton
Elizabeth Hopkins	Bishop Grosseteste College, Lincoln
Karen Hudson	University of Northumbria
Terence Hudson	Sheffield Hallam University
Joy Jarvis	University of Hertfordshire
Sal Jarvis	University of Hertfordshire
Marj Jeavons	Birmingham College of Food, Tourism and Creative Studies
Gordon Kirk	University of Edinburgh
Sue Lyle	Swansea Institute of Higher Education
Jacqui MacDonald	Institute of Education, University of London
Pat Mahony	Roehampton University
Jayne May	University of Chichester
Heather Meacock	Anglia Ruskin University
Paul Morgan	University of Edinburgh
Debbie Moss	Keele University
Penny Noel	University of Huddersfield
James Percival	Oxford Brookes University
Carl Peters	University of Wales, Newport
Fiona B Rodger	Institute of Education, University of London
Alison Ryan	Sheffield Hallam University
Anne Slater	University of East London
Jim Smith	Bishop Grosseteste University College, Lincoln
Kathryn Southworth	Newman College of Higher Education
Jenny Stuart-Collins	Trinity & All Saints
Simon Thompson	University of Sussex
John Trafford	University of Huddersfield
Nicola Warren-Lee	Oxford University
Jenny Westwood	Napier University
Diane Wiggins	UCE Birmingham
Debra Wilson	Newman College
Kathryn Wright	University of East London
Terry Wrigley	University of Edinburgh

Contents

Section 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Rationale	1
1.2 Purpose	2
1.3 Theoretical perspectives	3
 Section 2: Using the Guidelines to influence policy and practice	 5
2.1 Planning a strategy for induction of new teacher educators	5
2.2 Working with heads of department/middle managers	5
2.3 Working with mentors	6
2.4 Induction as an individualised three year process	7
 Section 3: Areas for review and development	 10
3.1 Role design	11
3.2 Organisational learning	12
3.3 Pedagogy of initial teacher education	13
3.4 School-based roles	14
3.5 Formal courses – Postgraduate Certificate/MA	15
3.6 Scholarship and research activity	16
 Section 4: Looking ahead	 18
 References	 19

1. Introduction

1.1 Rationale

These guidelines aim to stimulate debate and action to improve the induction of new university-based teacher educators. The guidelines are based on our interpretation and application of research but also on the experience of teacher educators but also other generic work on becoming an academic. Teacher educators teaching on initial teacher education (ITE) courses in higher education (HE) institutions in England are almost always appointed with prior experience of being qualified school teachers, with considerable experience of teaching and of middle or senior management in the school sector. Entering higher education they bring with them a wealth of pedagogical knowledge and expertise accrued in and through school teaching. In the teacher education system in England this is often the main reason for their recruitment. They work within academic departments but also within educational partnerships with schools and this provides a complex and challenging workplace setting. New Teacher Educators (NTEs) often enter higher education without doctoral level qualifications in education or other sustained experience of research and publication processes. NTEs present a wide diversity of starting points on their appointment to higher education posts and these guidelines are based on the principle that induction will need to be flexible and adaptable to suit the needs of individuals.

We also recognise the wide range of institutional contexts in which ITE departments are located; in particular there is a wide variation in the expectations and pressure for published research outcomes. The guidelines are therefore intended to provoke and inform local review, within institutions and education departments, rather than present a blueprint. A wide range of colleagues has already contributed to the development of these guidelines; they are a collaborative effort and should be viewed as a work in progress. Further evaluation of the implementation of the guidelines and of specific aspects of induction for teacher educators needs to continue.

Previous research on the induction of NTEs in the UK has identified that formal higher education induction for this group of academics has often been very limited (Maguire, 1994; Sinkinson, 1997). This perceived inadequacy of formal induction structures may be placed within the context of the overall devaluation of pedagogical skills in British higher education until the publication of the Dearing Report (NCIHE, 1997). This report identified the need for more focus on learning, teaching and assessment across the whole of the HE sector, including better induction procedures for all new academics. Since this date, formal induction provision in most disciplines has become more extensive, often requiring the completion of a Postgraduate Certificate in teaching in higher education, and with probationary requirements and structures specified through human resources and staff development units. There has also been an increased focus on non-formal professional learning during induction (Trowler & Knight, 2000; Eraut, 2000) and on subject discipline-specific issues.

But the findings of two recent research papers commissioned by ESCalate and the Higher Education Academy (Boyd et al., 2006; Murray 2005b) indicate that, for a variety of reasons, NTEs continue to receive uneven, and at times inadequate, induction provision. Both of these studies found that much of the induction provision for NTEs is situated within departments at the micro level of the teaching 'team', and takes place through non-formal learning. One of the induction issues identified in the sources quoted above is the problematic assumption perhaps made by some teacher educators and their line managers that knowledge and understanding of teaching acquired in the school sector can be 'transferred' to higher education with few problems. Another important issue is the induction of NTEs into the formal research and publication activities associated with academic work.

Studies of new teacher educators in a variety of different contexts (see for example Ducharme, 1993; Kremer-Hayon & Zuzovsky, 1995; Sinkinson, 1997; Hatt, 1997; Murray & Male, 2005; Boyd et al.,

2006) have identified that, while the transition between school teaching and higher education work may seem like a small shift of occupation and setting, individuals often experience the change as challenging and stressful. Many teacher educators have difficulties in adjusting to the academic expectations of higher education-based teacher education work (Ducharme, 1993). Uncertainty about the exact nature of their new professional roles, finding it difficult to adjust to the pedagogical skills needed to work with adult learners, and concerns about the adequacy of the professional and academic knowledge bases necessary for higher education work (Kremer-Hayon & Zuzovsky, 1995) have all been identified as areas of stress.

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide a tool with which academic leaders and other staff may review the induction experience of NTEs critically within their institution and plan for enhancement of that experience. In addition the guidelines will be of use to NTEs themselves; in providing some understanding of their experience, and in helping them to plan their own professional development. Induction is taken to mean the first three years after appointment to a higher education academic role from a school-based role. This definition deliberately goes beyond the initial year, an acknowledged time of challenge for NTEs, and includes time to establish identities and roles and to develop a firm basis for future professional development.

The significance of situated learning in the workplace (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Eraut, 2000; Fuller et al., 2005) means that induction includes both formal and non-formal experiences which promote professional learning. Whilst it is not possible or desirable to plan all non-formal activity we argue that it is possible to design structural contexts that promote or provide opportunities for non-formal learning. We also contend that the boundaries between formal and non-formal professional learning activities are permeable and that to some extent such a distinction (Eraut, 2000), whilst useful as a planning tool, is not sustainable in a complex educational workplace setting.

In recent research projects NTEs themselves identified the following major priorities for teacher educator induction: developing their pedagogical knowledge and practice, including assessment, appropriate to teaching student teachers in HE settings; enhancing their scholarship, leading to publication in their chosen area of expertise; and acquiring the pragmatic knowledge necessary to acclimatise to the institution (Murray & Male, 2005; Boyd et al., 2006).

A considerable amount of the guidance provided here is generic; it applies to new lecturers in a range of professional subject disciplines. However there are also significant elements that are strongly tied in with the subject discipline of ITE and by setting this guidance firmly within this context we hope that academic leaders in ITE will find it of particular resonance and practical assistance in improving the induction and early professional learning of newly appointed colleagues. Induction for NTEs needs to reflect the accepted discourses and practices of teacher education as a professional discipline in the university sector in addition to meeting more general institutional requirements for probation.

A challenge facing the enhancement of induction for NTEs is that resources are constrained within HE and some of the strategies outlined in this guidance do involve costs. We have concentrated on the more effective application and design of structures and processes which are often already in place in many institutions. Departments and individual NTEs will face significant challenges in prioritising continuing professional development (CPD) in the face of the intensification of academic life and heavy workloads. The induction experience for NTEs is likely to be more effective when it considers the quality of the student experience in tandem with research and scholarship within the department. This focus deserves some priority in the allocation of scarce resources.

1.3 Theoretical perspectives

A nationwide study of provision for NTEs in higher education institutions in England has shown that most induction takes place within departments at the level of the teaching 'team', and through non-formal learning (Murray, 2005a). Trowler and Knight (2000), in their generic study of academic induction, argue that this team level is the most important context for induction to higher education and they emphasise the significance of departmental leadership.

In common with other learning and teaching policies in higher education the approach adopted to the induction of new academics involves possible tension between the managerialist/strategic agenda of the institution or department and the professional development and interests of the individual. We consider that a balance between these two agendas is required. This opinion is reflected in this guidance by the emphasis on individualised approaches but within a framework for developing learning communities. The focus of this guidance is at the departmental or team level but it does involve creating an extended framework within which individual NTEs will be enabled to develop their personal and professional identities.

Scholarly and Research Activity (SARA) is seen in these guidelines as an integral part of the complexity of teacher educators' work and their professional expertise as 'second order practitioners' (Murray, 2002) who are involved in teaching about teaching. In a discussion of teacher educators' roles Cochran-Smith (2005) asserts that 'part of the task of the teacher educators is functioning simultaneously as both researcher and practitioner' and she refers to the 'reciprocal, recursive and symbiotic relationships' between scholarship and practice as 'working the dialectic' (p.219). From her perspective such symbiotic relationships have 'fed' and enriched teacher education. These guidelines reflect a similar commitment to the integral place of scholarship and research in the work of all teacher educators.

It is possible to view teacher education partnership as consisting of two different activity systems; the academic department and the placement schools (Boyd et al., 2006). The roles of the NTE, the student teacher and the mentor may then be viewed as boundary-crossing between the two systems. Contradictions between the two systems create tensions which NTEs need to work within. NTEs may view their 'credibility' with students as being strongly based on their recent classroom experience and their credibility as a schoolteacher rather than on their credibility as an academic. This is strongly bound up with the identity of individual NTEs (Murray & Male, 2005) and is an area in which perhaps the support of a mentor on an individual basis is likely to be most effective.

Murray (2002) sees NTEs as moving from being *first order practitioners* – that is school teachers – to being *second order practitioners* as teacher educators. Where they once worked in the *first order setting* of the school sector, they now work in the *second order setting* of HE. For those working mainly as initial teacher educators their academic 'discipline' is their knowledge of schooling, of the first order context. But, as second order practitioners, teacher educators induct their students into the practices and discourses of both school teaching and teacher education.

The limitations of trying to improve induction through changes to processes and structures need to be borne in mind and the conclusion of Trowler and Knight is pertinent, that the 'quality of communication and relationships in daily practice is more significant than centrally determined induction arrangements' (2000, p.37). We consider that a centrally provided element of induction is useful, not least because of its ability to promote networking across departmental boundaries. The situated learning literature (Lave & Wenger, 1991 & 1999; Wenger, 1998) has developed the useful concept of 'community of practice' and this has been considered in educational contexts (Fuller et al., 2005). It is important that the often competitive and negotiated nature of academic communities is acknowledged (Kogan, 2000). The voluntary, organic, self-directed nature of successful communities

of practice means that organisational design cannot control their development (Wenger et al., 2002). The key is to accept that whilst it is possible to design formal structures and processes it is not possible to control the practice that will emerge in response to them. There is a need to manage the balance between organisational goals and engagement by professionals with the freedom to explore and innovate. It is possible to set out principles for cultivating communities of practice (Wenger et al., 2002) but not to provide a template for their design.

Focusing on communities of practice and participation in them by newcomers may lead to an over-emphasis on induction work with individuals. In their analysis Evans et al. (2006) argue convincingly that in trying to improve workplace learning there is a need to find a balance between considering the perspectives of individuals and aiming to influence workplace culture. They suggest that the focus should be on the interactions between individuals and the workplace culture. Application of activity theory perspectives (Engestrom 1999, 2001) leads more clearly towards a team level of educational development work and a focus on rules, tools and division of labour (Knight et al., 2006). The concept of an 'expansive learning environment' was developed by Fuller and Unwin (2003) building on work by Engestrom (2001). An expansive learning environment is one that presents wide-ranging opportunities for learning and a culture which promotes such learning.

Hodkinson and Hodkinson (2005) focused on the learning environment of school teachers and developed, from Fuller and Unwin's work (2003), a continuum of expansive–restrictive learning environments for teachers which is set out in Figure 1. This provides a useful conceptual framework for one of the most challenging elements of improving induction for NTEs - the development of an expansive learning environment.

<<<EXPANSIVE learning environment	RESTRICTIVE learning environment >>>
Close collaborative working	Isolated, individualist working
Colleagues mutually supportive in enhancing teacher learning	Colleagues obstruct or do not support each others' learning
An explicit focus on teacher learning, as a dimension of normal working practices	No explicit focus on teacher learning, except to meet crises or imposed initiatives
Supported opportunities for personal development that goes beyond institutional or government priorities	Teacher learning mainly strategic compliance with government or institutional agendas
Out of institution educational opportunities including time to stand back, reflect and think differently	Few out-of-institution educational opportunities, only narrow, short training programmes
Opportunities to integrate off the job learning into everyday practice	No opportunity to integrate off the job learning
Opportunities to participate in more than one working group	Work restricted to one departmental team within one institution
Opportunity to extend professional identity through boundary crossing into other departments, institutional activities, other institutions, subject networks and beyond	Opportunities for boundary crossing only come with a job change
Support for local variation in ways of working and learning for teachers and work groups	Standardised approaches to teacher learning are prescribed and imposed
Teachers use a wide range of learning opportunities	Teachers use narrow range of learning approaches

Figure 1. Continuum of expansive–restrictive learning environments for HE teachers

It is important to note in considering Figure 1 that the staff themselves are a significant part of the context and help to create a more expansive or more restrictive learning environment. In a useful case study, Staniforth and Harland (2006) conclude that there is a need to support the individual new academic to take a proactive approach to their own induction and that the head of department should perhaps adopt a monitoring role and delegate the role of mentor to a colleague so that power relationships do not distort the process.

If attempts to improve the induction of NTEs are to be effective it is likely that they will seek a balance between the needs of individual NTEs and those of the employer, that they will view professional learning as an essential but integrated aspect of day to day work, and that they will not fall into the trap of seeking short term, measurable outcomes (Evans et al., 2006).

2. Using the Guidelines to influence policy and practice

The purpose of this section is to discuss the ways in which ideas within these guidelines might be used to influence policy and practice within institutions in order to improve the induction of NTEs.

2.1 Planning a strategy for induction of NTEs

Although we have broken down the induction of new teacher educators into several themes in Section 3 we are not suggesting that it would be effective to pick out and focus on one or more of the areas; rather we would argue that a cohesive approach is required.

One of the key decisions to be made by an education department is the balance between provision of induction at the different levels of: subject discipline networks; institutional central provision; departmental and teaching team activity; one-to-one mentoring by a colleague. Whilst more centralised provision may be more economical it is likely that local departmental activity will be more able to stimulate additional and valuable non-formal learning.

2.2 Working with heads of department/middle managers

One key area of work is to engage those colleagues who carry line management responsibility for NTEs. These will be heads of department and other middle managers. Middle managers have a significant role within higher education in mediating institutional policy (Helawell & Hancock, 2001) and they may tend to identify with academic staff and be somewhat resistant and sceptical about centrally provided induction (Clegg, 2003). It may be useful to establish a clear view of induction of NTEs as an integrated process involving departmental activity and non-formal learning as well as centrally provided induction. A middle-up-down approach (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995) to management in which middle managers play a role in narrowing the gap between the strategic vision of top management and the reality experienced by academic staff of academic departments and teams seems appropriate.

Heads of department hold a key role in leading the local departmental or teaching team induction activities that are so important in providing just-in-time and subject-specific professional learning. In addition, heads of department have a key role in leading and developing the professional ethos of their department. They will influence the quality of everyday discussion, sharing and support amongst staff which is where so much of professional learning takes place. A structural tension exists for heads of department, between their responsibility for allocating teaching and administrative duties to academics and their role in protecting new staff and creating time for induction activities. Planning for the development of induction needs to raise and deal with this tension explicitly. The review of job design set out in section 3.1 is a key area in which this tension is played out in practice.

The selection and development of mentors who are academics assigned to support NTEs is an important role of heads of department.

2.3 Working with mentors

The selection and support of mentors is important. Mentors have the potential to play a key role in the induction of NTEs. There may be significant advantages in having a mentor who is not the line manager of the NTE because this at least helps to provide an alternative mentoring relationship in which trust can be built up to further facilitate effective reflective learning (Boud & Walker, 1998; Schwiebert et al., 2000; Staniforth & Harland, 2006). If the line manager does act as mentor then this might provide a more direct route to gaining additional resources or action to resolve issues arising but it does have a price in terms of the structural power difference introduced into the mentoring relationship. Tenner (2004) points out some of the hazards of traditional mentorship within academic contexts. Johnson and DeSpain (2004) focus on mentoring in support of publication and adopt a pragmatic approach to power within the relationship. Attempts to create more collegial frameworks for mentoring have been created for example within postgraduate certificate courses for new lecturers (Mathias, 2005). Formal approaches are sometimes limited in resolving issues of power and relationships within mentoring and it is likely that NTEs will need to use multiple mentors including those in non-formal roles. Overall the aim is to create a workplace in which non-formal mentoring and forming groups for support is encouraged and valued in addition to formal mentoring provision.

It is important that the mentor is committed to the task, well-informed with regard to institutional structures and knowledgeable and enquiring in terms of pedagogy for ITE. But it is also important that all parties are aware of the potential abuse of power relationships within the mentoring process and the need for an ethical approach (Warren, 2005). For example Quinlan (1999) focuses on the potential for mentoring to support academic women, and considers that a range of networking opportunities may be helpful in complementing the formal mentoring process in order to overcome some of the difficulties of cross-gender mentoring.

It is likely that mentors will benefit from some direct guidance and support for their role and institutions need to consider what this might consist of and how it might be delivered. Written guidance on the role, support from the line manager, face-to-face or online briefing for the role and opportunities to share experiences and reflect on practice are just some of the possible provisions that might be made. Garvey and Alred (2000) review mentor preparation in higher education and argue strongly for an experiential workshop approach to mentor development. They use Egan's skilled helper model (1994) of Explore–Understand–Action as part of their framework for mentors and emphasise the need for mentors in practice to realise the significance of the exploratory element rather than feeling pressured to move too quickly towards action.

The status of mentoring may need to be raised and maintained. One way of doing this might be by recognising the mentoring role in terms of workload allocation. A second approach might be to consider it explicitly as a step towards developing the professional skills required for future leadership roles and this might link to the UK Professional Standards for Teaching and Supporting Learning in Higher Education (Higher Education Academy, 2006). Mentors need to be aware of the stresses that NTEs face and to be informed about both the formal and non-formal professional learning that contributes to their induction.

Barkham (2005) analyses her own experience of mentoring during her first year as a teacher educator and usefully suggests qualities required of the successful mentee. She broadly supports the value of mentoring but argues that the mentee needs to take significant responsibility for the development of the mentoring relationship and that power should be negotiated between the mentee and mentor. Throughout the induction process the NTE will benefit by adopting a pro-active, flexible

approach, listening to and also questioning colleagues. The mentoring process provides opportunities to support the development of an increasingly critical professional stance.

Mentoring of NTEs appears to have the potential to provide individualised and effective support during induction but if it is to be successful it requires careful design and commitment in terms of the department as well as the individuals concerned.

2.4 Induction as an individualised three year process

The existing research on NTEs in the UK context (see, inter alia, Boyd et al., 2006; Hatt, 1997; Maguire, 1994; Murray, 2005a; Murray & Male, 2005; Murray, 2002; Sinkinson, 1997) indicates that whilst the first year is a time of rapid learning and acquisition of new forms of knowledge and understanding, very significant professional growth continues in the second and third years of ITE work. These guidelines reflect these findings by viewing induction support for NTEs as a three-year process.

Research (Boyd et al., 2006; Murray, 2005a) also indicates that there are three priorities for most NTEs in their first year:

- ♦ 'survival' in terms of understanding the basics of how the department and the institution work;
- ♦ 'shifting the lens' of existing expertise in teaching by coming to terms with the differing pedagogical demands of working with adults;
- ♦ 'laying the foundations' for scholarship and research activity as an academic by building on existing expert knowledge.

Once past the first year, NTEs often need to consolidate their learning in all of these areas, developing teaching and research activities which are informed by scholarship and deepening professional expertise for second order work. In section 3.6 we discuss the development of scholarship and research activities for NTEs, suggesting that this can be seen as moving from 'inquiring into' an area of expertise to 'contributing to' it through the production of original research.

Some key questions on appointment of a New Teacher Educator are:

- ♦ What attitudes and aspirations about moving into HE does the NTE have?
- ♦ What does s/he see as induction priorities, given the role description for her/his work?
- ♦ What strengths does the NTE bring from teaching pupils (and perhaps adults)?
- ♦ What knowledge of educational leadership and administration does the NTE bring?
- ♦ What strengths in scholarship and research does the NTE bring?
- ♦ How could the NTE and those responsible for induction in the institution most effectively build on these strengths?
- ♦ What are the institutional/departmental expectations of the NTE, especially with regard to scholarship and research activity?
- ♦ What are the probationary requirements? What timeframe is the NTE given for achieving these? Is the induction programme clearly designed to help meet these?
- ♦ If the NTE is part-time then how will s/he gain access to formal and non-formal learning?



As we have identified in Section 1, in making the career transition to higher education, NTEs encounter the practices, norms and expectations of academic work, as these are understood in the context of their particular department. Institutional and departmental expectations of teacher educators vary considerably, as do the professional biographies, dispositions and practices of NTEs. As identified earlier, most NTEs enter HE with their experiential knowledge and understanding of school teaching as a major strength. They are also likely to enter the sector without doctoral level qualifications in education or other sustained experience of research and publication processes. But the specific **entry profile** of individual NTEs will vary, as will their developmental needs. These guidelines therefore recommend creating an entry profile which details the NTE's past professional experiences and strengths soon after her/his appointment. Alongside the **role description**, this document can then be used to create an individualised induction programme.


The biography of each NTE will require an individual design for their development within the planned induction framework. Some key questions to inform planning for induction of an NTE over a three year process are:

- ♦ What changes in the nature of the NTE's work are expected between Year 1 and Year 3?
- ♦ What are her/his career aspirations over this timeframe? How do these build towards longer term career goals?
- ♦ What resources and established ways of working are available within the department to support the NTE over these transitions?
- ♦ What support will enable the NTE to work most effectively in year 1?
- ♦ What support will enable the NTE to work and develop most effectively in Years 2-3?
- ♦ How will induction support in Years 1-3 lay the foundations for long term professional development as a teacher educator?

Some generalised possible priorities for NTEs over a three year induction process are presented in Figure 2. We would expect the emphasis within and beyond these suggestions to vary considerably depending on the individual NTE's needs.

	Within about one year of appointment
Possible NTE priorities within this timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ 'Survival' in terms of understanding the basics of the ways in which the institution, the department and the courses work. ♦ Developing a focus on student-teacher learning, drawing on existing expertise in teaching school pupils (and perhaps adults) as well as scholarship to develop pedagogy for ITE and CPD. This may be facilitated by participating on a PgC course for new lecturers. ♦ Starting on the journey of becoming an active researcher by extending their existing knowledge through scholarship in a selected area of subject expertise. ♦ Ensuring that teaching is informed by scholarship and by knowledge of relevant national and institutional frameworks. ♦ Participating in collaborative research projects and/or beginning formal Masters or Doctoral level study. ♦ Experimenting with forms of academic and professional writing for example by producing learning resources in ITE which involve considerable scholarship.
	Within two to three years of appointment
Possible NTE priorities within this timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Developing deeper level knowledge of the institution and how it works. ♦ Extending the range of pedagogical knowledge and skills used in teaching teachers underpinned by pedagogical scholarship. This should include growing awareness of wider debates and practices in other institutions and a critical perspective on current ITE policy and practice. ♦ Building up scholarship in area(s) of subject expertise. Using scholarship to inform personal development as an active researcher. ♦ Informing teaching with scholarship and, increasingly, with personal research. ♦ Consolidating roles and expertise for working in partnerships with schools. ♦ Pursuing study and research to gain a higher-level academic qualification at Masters or Doctoral level depending on the individual. ♦ Developing the chosen area of expertise through scholarship, research and publication.

Figure 2: Suggested priorities for NTEs over a three year induction process



3. Areas for review and development

This section sets out six areas that may need to be reviewed and developed. It is important to consider the links between and across these areas in order to create a coherent induction framework.

3.1 Role design	11
3.2 Organisational learning	12
3.3 Pedagogy of initial teacher education	13
3.4 School-based role	14
3.5 Formal courses Postgraduate Certificate/MA	15
3.6 Scholarship and research activity	16 - 17


Key questions for each section:

- ♦ What is the current situation in this area?
- ♦ How might this area be developed?
- ♦ How does this relate to other areas and to the overall coherence of induction?

3.1 Role Design

The individual work situation of NTEs will vary considerably even within one institution or department and this means that it may be valuable to consider the design of their role carefully. The size and number of subject or teaching teams that they are required to join will have a significant bearing on their induction experience.

- ♦ NTEs will bring with them a wide variation in prior experience and expertise. The role design will need to take note of the initial audit and aim both to make use of the strengths and develop the areas of relative weakness of the NTE. This planning will need to begin as early as possible, preferably soon after appointment, because it may have implications for other staff and require a considerable amount of negotiation.
- ♦ The potential for designing the role of NTEs will be constrained by the available staffing resources and this may create considerable pressure on middle managers to give NTEs a heavy workload and take on a fairly full role from day one of their appointment. This pressure must be resisted if NTEs are to have some space for reflective learning and for the additional induction activities required of them.
- ♦ Clearer expectations may be established through discussion between NTE, line manager, and mentor around the job description and the likely annual cycle of work of the NTE. Exit interviews of teacher educators moving on may be a useful source of information.
- ♦ There is a need to avoid membership of too many teams because this may limit the ability of the NTE to participate and contribute fully to any single team. On the other hand there is a need to avoid membership being within only one small team because this may limit the experience of the NTE in terms of sharing a range of practice and opportunities to build networks and to identify informal mentors.
- ♦ There is a need to identify potential isolation of the NTE even where they appear to be joining a reasonably sized team. This may be caused for example by geographical location of site or even simply office space. It may also be caused by the busy nature of departmental life; both formal and non-formal interventions may be needed to counter this.
- ♦ There is a direct link from role design to departmental CPD opportunities because the choice of the teams that the NTE will join will have a considerable influence on the quality of everyday discussion and non-formal support. This relates to the need to work towards an expansive learning environment as discussed in Section 1.3.
- ♦ Part of the problem for role design, especially in primary school phase ITE programmes, is that the NTEs may be contributing to complex programmes with large loosely associated teaching teams rather than smaller tight teams and well-defined smaller groups of students. Of course it is also worth considering the student perspective on this commonly found situation.
- ♦ Providing opportunities for networking across boundaries within the institution may be possible through participation in a formal CPD course (see section 3.5).
- ♦ A consideration of the school-based role of NTEs is important, see Section 3.4.



3.2 Organisational learning

Here the term organisational learning refers to how NTEs find their way around the systems and language of their higher education institution. This covers a range of knowledge from finding out how to order some staples to understanding how assessment boards fit into the academic process. NTEs may feel reluctant to ask for advice. For example, they may feel too awkward to ask for acronyms to be explained during a team meeting.

- ♦ It is important to avoid overload of organisational information in the early days of induction; a more appropriate approach is to aim for provision of information 'at point of need'.
- ♦ Time management is critical. At the centre of this in a practical way is that NTEs need to use their diary to plan the academic year, to plan time for marking, scholarship and so on. School teachers often do not need to use a diary for daily planning and time allocation because they are timetabled. Using a diary for workload planning may be new to NTEs and it is a key tool in terms of managing stress and being effective.
- ♦ It is important to accept that as a professional group, teacher educators need to address workload issues. However in the meantime the NTE needs to survive. Prioritising is critical. NTEs may tend to prioritise teaching and planning because these are central to their identity and perceived credibility. NTEs may be tempted by requests and offers to become involved in a range of projects and additional duties. They may need support in saying 'no'.
- ♦ The use of specialist language including acronyms may undermine the confidence of NTEs and make them feel isolated. A glossary from the institution and from the subject discipline area might be useful here because developing a shared language is important in developing a sense of belonging. Acronyms and other specialist language need to be fully explained during formal and non formal discussion when NTEs are present.
- ♦ The organisation of assessment and quality assurance (QA) processes is a key area of learning for NTEs. The public accountability element of assessment and QA procedures may be perceived by NTEs as threatening and they will appreciate careful explanation of the role of QA procedures.
- ♦ It may be helpful to assign a member of administration staff to each NTE with a clear and explicit role as first port of call for enquiries concerning administrative procedures.

3.3 Pedagogy of initial teacher education

The evidence suggests that transition from school teacher into teacher educator is a challenging process in terms of teaching itself; new teacher educators need to be supported in their development of a pedagogy suitable for adult learners and for the subject discipline.

- ♦ NTEs bring a considerable repertoire of teaching skills from working in the school sector but most NTEs still report needing support in developing a pedagogy for teaching in HE (Boyd et al., 2006; Murray, 2005a&b). Most NTEs in the same studies reported considerable professional learning in relation to teaching adults in HE through non-formal learning on the job and through formal PgC courses. It seems clear that teaching skills from the school sector cannot simply be 'transferred' to working with student teachers.
- ♦ One of the particular aspects of initial teacher education is its layered nature – it is teaching about teaching. This creates a complex learning environment and NTEs need to engage with conceptions of 'modelling' within their teaching practice (Loughran & Berry, 2005).
- ♦ NTEs need to be introduced to debate on the key principles of pedagogy for ITE (for example Loughran, 2006; Korthagen et al., forthcoming) as well as the range of learning strategies and activities used, including for example the place of e-learning. The Higher Education Academy subject centre for education (ESCalate), the Teacher Training Resource Bank (TTRB) and Universities Council for the Education of Teachers (UCET) offer relevant resources in this area.
- ♦ If NTEs are required to complete a PgC course then it is vital that it engages them in critical consideration of generic pedagogical issues in adult and higher education and the specific issues and literature of ITE pedagogy. If NTEs do not participate in a PgC course then the Education department needs to consider how newcomers will be supported in developing their pedagogy and in building networks across the wider academic communities of their institutions.
- ♦ It is important to consider the amount of freedom that exists for the NTE to plan their own teaching and/or contribute to, and influence planning by, teaching teams. A balance needs to be found, and the NTE needs to be made aware of perhaps unwritten conventions regarding sharing of teaching plans and resources and opportunities to observe other colleagues teaching.
- ♦ NTEs may benefit from some explicit consideration of their developing knowledge base which includes varied and inter-related elements including school practice and policy, school curriculum subject knowledge, learning theory, ITE pedagogy and educational research. They need to be supported in developing a critical engagement and perspective on government policy frameworks concerning schooling, curriculum and ITE itself.
- ♦ Assessment in higher education is highlighted by NTEs as a particular area where support is required; many find it stressful, confusing and time-consuming. Generic workshops or guidance from a central unit might be of use in aspects such as design of assessment. However these need to be in addition to individual support within the teaching team on marking student work as well as help during the assessment process including second-marking and moderation meetings.
- ♦ There is some evidence (Boyd et al., 2006) that NTEs may tend to make themselves too readily available for informal support of students. NTEs need to engage with the literature on developing students as independent learners and be able to debate how this should shape ITE programmes and practices.

3.4 School-based roles

NTEs have multiple roles which develop from working in partnerships with schools to plan, teach and evaluate ITE programmes. These may include supporting students and their school-based mentors, assessment and moderation of standards, and ideally collaborative professional learning with students and mentors. This is an area of work to which many NTEs will bring considerable strengths, not least experiences of having worked as mentors on HE partnership or school-based teacher training routes. Because of these experiences there is a risk that managers/colleagues will assume that little induction support is needed.

- ♦ The school-based role of a teacher educator is a very explicit site for the emergence of the tension that exists within initial teacher education as a subject discipline between educational theory (propositional knowledge) and practice (procedural knowledge and practice-based theory). NTEs need to be given the opportunity to reflect on this tension, to discuss it with colleagues and to consider how it should be handled in their professional relationships with school-based colleagues and students.
- ♦ Partnership in pre-service courses is a complex idea in part because, as Furlong et al. (2005) state, at its heart is 'the complexity and contestability of professional knowledge' (p.19). Current models of partnership in ITE mean that working in school-based settings has organisational, epistemological, ethical and pedagogical complexities for teacher educators (Furlong et al., 2005; Murray, 2007). NTEs need time, space and guidance to come to terms with these complexities.
- ♦ The work of teacher educators in their partnership schools includes adopting what Guile and Lucas (1999) have termed a 'pedagogy of guidance' (p.212). There are tensions but also tremendous learning opportunities in the tripartite arrangement between student, school-based mentor and university-based tutor. Some of the tension may be based around the university-based tutor's credibility as a 'school-teacher' and also around the value of theory in relation to classroom performance. NTEs need to be prepared for this situation and have time with colleagues to debate and discuss the issues arising and suitable approaches to their work with schools.
- ♦ There is a structural issue in ITE partnership because education departments need the school placements. The benefits for schools in providing placements are more tenuous and debatable (Furlong et al., 2000; Boyd, 2002; Furlong et al., 2005). NTEs need to be aware of this situation but still feel able to work as equal partners with school-based colleagues in difficult situations such as supporting struggling or failing students.
- ♦ Strategies for supporting the NTE in their school-based work might include an information pack, workshop session, shadowing of an experienced colleague and joint observations with experienced colleagues. The line manager needs to consider how the NTE will consolidate or further develop this area of their work by establishing critical friends or group support in order to be able to ask questions and discuss problems in a secure setting. There will sometimes be difficult issues for example in relation to failing students, disagreement over assessment or possible lack of quality of a placement.

3.5 Formal courses – Postgraduate Certificate/MA

In reassessing key concepts in workplace learning, Fuller et al. (2005) argue that the dismissal of formal courses by Lave & Wenger (1991) was based on a view of such provision as transmission. They recognise the contribution that formal courses might make and stress the significance of how such courses are perceived.

...it becomes possible to see structured courses as merely another form of participatory learning...it works best when it is accepted as a legitimate activity for novices and full members, in the community of practice concerned. (Fuller et al., 2005, p.66)

Well-designed formal courses may promote or even provoke workplace learning by participants within their subject discipline context. Tacit knowledge is often developed, acquired and used 'unobserved' in the 'interstices of formal learning contexts' (Eraut, 2000, p.133).

- ♦ A key question is the institutional policy on mandatory completion of a PgC in learning and teaching in HE: should NTEs, who will invariably already hold a teaching qualification, be exempted from gaining a PgC at HE level?
- ♦ Evidence emerging from studies of NTEs does suggest that there is support from NTEs who have completed a PgC for the value of such a course as part of induction (Murray & Male, 2005; Boyd et al., 2006).
- ♦ Some NTEs will bring considerable experience of delivering CPD. This may be useful adult education experience but it may not have included critical elements of HE such as formal assessment. What level of relevant experience for example of CPD provision will exempt NTEs from completion of a PgC at HE level?
- ♦ The flexibility of a PgC course in terms of providing for the individual needs of different NTEs is important. Above all the course needs to support NTEs in critical engagement with subject specific pedagogy, see Section 3.3.
- ♦ Close co-operation between the PgC and the department and subject discipline is important and strong two-way communication links through mentors and line managers is likely to be part of establishing an effective partnership approach to the induction of NTEs.
- ♦ If a PgC course adopts a practitioner research approach to learning and teaching and includes within this an element of research methodology and skills then this may be particularly appropriate for teacher educators because of its relevance to the subject discipline.
- ♦ Participation in a formal course such as a PgC will provide opportunities for boundary-crossing, networking and sharing of practice. If a PgC is not included in an individual NTE's induction then other opportunities need to be built in and role design may be one way of doing this, e.g. through involving the NTE in a cross-faculty programme.
- ♦ NTEs may be appointed prior to gaining a Masters level qualification and for these staff completion of the PgC should provide credit towards their MA award. A Masters level dissertation will provide a structured opportunity for a significant research project.

3.6 Scholarship and research activity

Scholarship and research activity (SARA) is seen in these guidelines as an integral part of the complexity of teacher educators' work and their professional expertise. In some ways all that has come before is a preamble to dealing with this issue. Many NTEs enter higher education without sustained experience of research and publication. They have expert knowledge of teaching, some of it explicitly informed by scholarship, but much of it may be tacit. Enhancing their scholarship is a key issue during induction (Murray, 2005b). The level of scholarship and research activity is a distinguishing factor of university–school partnership approaches to ITE, as compared to employment-based routes, and its relationship to the quality of the student experience is critical.

NTEs need to become quickly aware of the distinctive character of higher education where teaching is closely bonded to scholarship and research, and there may well be institutional expectations that all academics are active researchers. In particular, it is important that NTEs have a clear understanding of the definition and expectations of scholarship and research within their institution and of how that is interpreted and mediated within the education department.

It may be helpful, though not essential, to see progression in SARA as moving from inquiring *into* an area of expertise related to teaching, learning and/or teacher education through to *contributing actively* to it (ATE, 2003). In this formulation *inquiry* aims at a thorough knowledge of the area and may be achieved through processes such as sustained reading, personal reflexivity on practice and involvement in small-scale research projects. *Contribution* involves the engagement in writing, publication and dissemination of some form of original research and aims to achieve a critical and informed contribution to the area.


In Boyer et al's (1994) terms it may also help to consider induction into SARA as a process of moving from the *scholarship of application* (integrating theory with practice) to the *scholarship of discovery* (the production of original research). This is a progression which requires sustained support from the beginning of Year 1 through to the end of induction in Year 3 and on into mid-career development. It is important that expectations of progression are realistic and that they take into account the NTE's starting points and career aspirations.

Key Questions:

- ♦ What strengths in SARA does the NTE bring into HE?
- ♦ What are the NTE's previous experiences of SARA?
- ♦ What attitudes and aspirations about SARA does the NTE have?
- ♦ What does the NTE see as their future area of expertise?
- ♦ What are the institutional/departmental expectations of SARA for NTEs?
- ♦ Are there probationary requirements in this area? If so, over what time-frame do these take place?
- ♦ What are the institutional/departmental expectations of SARA for experienced teacher educators? How will these frame the institutional view of the NTE's development over the first three years?
- ♦ What resources and established ways of working are available within the department and the institution to support the NTE's development as scholar and researcher?

Scholarship and Research Activity: Issues and Strategies

- ♦ Ensure that expectations for SARA are realistic, especially for the first year in post. Set rising expectations over the three-year induction period for NTEs to acquire increasing levels of expertise and to reflect this growth by making the move from *inquiry* to *contribution*.
- ♦ Consider how workload allocation, the structure and staffing of ITE programmes, timetabling, the planning of scholarship time by individuals, and the practical arrangements in place for providing cover for the teaching of colleagues, might be reviewed and adjusted in order to make SARA more feasible. How might clear messages about the priority for SARA be made explicit through the practical arrangements taken to promote it?
- ♦ Consider how the institution's PgC in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education prepares and involves participants in practitioner research and how this may contribute to induction of NTEs. Self-study by teacher educators is now supported through a specialist journal *Studying Teacher Education* (published by Taylor & Francis) and this could form a way into published research activity for some NTEs.
- ♦ Support conventional research induction and development routes (for example, research training, and enrolment for Masters, EdDs or PhDs) but allow realistic timeframes. Where NTEs are not enrolled in formal programmes, provide research mentoring or support groups to ensure that the NTE has access to research capacity-building support.
- ♦ If the opportunities for research support, funding and dissemination are fragmented across the department, institution and subject discipline, consider how these can be drawn together and made accessible for the NTE.
- ♦ Consider what opportunities are provided for the NTE to join formal and informal research groups and projects which would help to build confidence and skills in empirical research and writing for publication. These may be within the department or wider groups within the subject discipline community.
- ♦ NTEs might be encouraged to initiate or join collaborative action-oriented practitioner research on learning and teaching in higher education, including aspects of ITE partnership, and this may form a useful route into research activity for academics in general (Kember, 2000). This methodology is viewed by some as particularly appropriate for teacher educators because of its congruence with the discipline of teacher education (McNiff & Whitehead, 2002). The value of such practitioner research is however still contested and Loughran (2006) provides a useful consideration of the debate.
- ♦ It may be appropriate to encourage early attempts at academic writing, these might be related to production of learning resources, and consider how non-formal mentoring might support the key challenge of developing writing and achieving publication (Johnson & DeSpain, 2004).
- ♦ It may be appropriate to support involvement in professional initiatives, including local or national projects, contribution to professional and academic conferences and the publication of books for audiences in the school sector.



4. Looking ahead

Enhancing induction for newly appointed teacher educators is a significant systemic challenge, one that has implications for all members of education departments and potential benefits for the creation of more effective learning communities for both new and experienced members of staff.

The challenge for induction of NTEs appears to be not to devise set induction programmes which will equip NTEs with a 'bag of tricks' full of generic pedagogical and research skills for HE work, but rather to give them the time, space, support and opportunities to reflect on and analyse their emerging practice as teacher educators and the questions, issues and dilemmas it raises. As Eraut (2000, p.133) states 'Tidy maps of knowledge and learning are usually deceptive'. The development of such an induction process and learning environment faces real challenges in the current accountability-led systems of higher education, where senior managers and external agencies may seek simplistic measures for the outcomes of professional learning. Education departments need to contribute to challenging and developing this policy framework at institutional and national level and we suggest that your own practitioner evaluation and research in your local context would produce useful evidence to support your arguments.

There may be unhelpful aspects of central institutional policy and practice that need to be mediated in the short term but perhaps in the longer term a more permanent change and improvement may be possible. Driving through change and developing the learning architecture of the institution (Dill, 1999) to enhance induction will be challenging but it may provide rich rewards. It might be helpful to seek the involvement and support of the learning and teaching unit and to frame the changes identified into the wider CPD framework of the institution and the corporate plan. It is particularly appropriate for an education department, perhaps involved in the provision of a PgC in Learning and Teaching for new lecturers, to seek to influence institutional policy on induction. The recently introduced UK National Framework for Professional Standards for Teaching and Supporting Learning (Higher Education Academy, 2006) may be useful to institutions and education departments in building a suitable structure for CPD activity, including induction. The National Framework encourages mediation of the standards by individual universities. We endorse that approach and rather than suggesting the development of national standards for teacher educators we suggest that individual education departments work to influence decisions at institutional level and to mediate the professional standards agreed to suit the particular needs of teacher educators.

Given the fast pace of change in both school and HE sectors, it seems likely that teacher education as a discipline will continue to develop at speed. This means that working on HE-based ITE courses will pose challenges to all teacher educators and particularly to the next 'generation' of NTEs entering universities and colleges. We would argue that this context is a strong reason why education departments should pay attention to enhancing workplace learning for all teacher educators and we hope that these guidelines might make a contribution to that process.

References

- Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) (2003). Standards for teacher educators. Available at: www.edu.departments/coe/ate/standards/TEstandards.htm [Accessed January, 2006].
- Barkham, J. (2005) Reflections and interpretations on life in academia: a mentee speaks. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 13 (3), 331-344.
- Boud, D. & Walker, D. (1998) Promoting reflection in professional courses: the challenge of context. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23 (2), 191-206.
- Boyd, P. (2002) 'Rose-Tinted Reflection? The Benefits for Teachers of Initial Teacher Education in Secondary Schools', *Journal of In-Service Education*, 28 (2), 203-217.
- Boyd, P., Baker, L., Harris, K., Kynch, C., & McVittie, E. (2006) Working with multiple identities: supporting new teacher education tutors in Higher Education, in Bloxham, S., Twiselton, S. & Jackson, A. (Eds.) *Challenges and Opportunities: developing learning and teaching in ITE across the UK, ESCalate 2005 Conference Proceedings, Higher Education Academy*. Available at www.escalate.ac.uk/2419 [Accessed May 2006].
- Boyer, E., Altbach, P., & Whitelaw, M. (1994). *The Academic Profession: an International Perspective*. Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Clegg, S. (2003) 'Learning and Teaching Policies in Higher Education: mediations and contradictions of practice', *British Educational Research Journal*, 29, (6), 803-819.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005) Teacher Educators as Researchers: multiple perspectives. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21 (2), 219-225.
- Dill, D.D. (1999) 'Academic accountability and university adaptation: the architecture of an academic learning organization', *Higher Education*, 38, 127-154.
- Ducharme, M. (1993) A study of Teacher educators: research from the USA. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 22 (1), 57-70.
- Egan, G. (1994) *The Skilled Helper: a problem management approach to helping*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks & Cole.
- Engestrom, Y. (1999) 'Activity Theory and individual and social transformation', in Engestrom, Y., Miettinen, R. & Punamaki, R. (Eds.) *Perspectives on Activity Theory*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Engestrom, Y. (2001) Expansive learning at work: towards an activity-theoretical reconceptualisation, *Journal of Education and Work*, 14 (1), 133-156.
- Eraut, M. (2000) 'Non-formal learning and tacit knowledge in professional work', *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 113-136.
- Evans, K., Hodkinson, P., Rainbird, H. & Unwin, L. (2006) *Improving Workplace Learning*, London: Routledge.
- Fuller, A. & Unwin, L. (2003) Learning as apprentices in the contemporary UK workplace: creating and managing expansive and restrictive participation, *Journal of Education and Work*, 16 (4), 407-426.

Fuller, A., Hodkinson, H., Hodkinson, P. & Unwin, L. (2005) 'Learning as peripheral participation in communities of practice: a reassessment of key concepts in workplace learning', *British Educational Research Journal*, 31 (1), 49-68.

Furlong, J., Barton, L., Miles, S., Whiting, C., & Whitty, G. (2000). *Teacher Education in Transition*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Furlong, J., Campbell, A., Howson, J., Lewis, S. & McNamara, O. (2005) Partnership in English Initial Teacher Education: changing times, changing definitions: Evidence from the TTA National Partnership Project. Paper presented to the British Educational Association Research Conference, Glamorgan. September 2005.

Garvey, B. & Alred, G. (2000) Educating Mentors. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 8 (2), 113-126.

Guile, B., & Lucas, N. (1999). Rethinking Initial Teacher Education and Professional Development in Further Education. In A. Green & N. Lucas (Eds.), *Further Education and Lifelong Learning: Realigning the Sector for the Twenty first Century* (pp. 203-224). London: Bedford Way Papers.

Hatt, A. (1997). Teacher into Tutor: a Personal Account of the Move from Primary Teaching to Initial Teacher Education. *Multicultural Teaching*, 19 (3), 43-47.

Helawell, D. & Hancock, N. (2001) A case study of the changing role of the academic middle manager in higher education: between hierarchical control and collegiality? *Research Papers in Education*, 16 (2), 183-197.

Higher Education Academy (2006) The UK Professional Standards Framework for Teaching and Supporting Learning in Higher Education. York: HEA. Available at www.heacademy.ac.uk/professionalstandards.htm [Accessed October 2006].

Hodkinson, H. & Hodkinson, P. (2005) Improving schoolteachers' workplace learning, *Research Papers in Education*, 20 (2), 109-131.

Johnson, J.A. & DeSpain, B.C. (2004) Mentoring the Reluctant Writer. *The Professional Educator*, 26 (2), 45-55.

Kember, D. (2000) *Action learning and action research : improving the quality of teaching and learning*. London: Kogan Page.

Kogan, M. (2000) Higher Education Communities and Academic Identity, *Higher Education Quarterly* 54 (3), 207-216.

Korthagen, F., Loughran, J. & Russell, T. (Forthcoming) Developing fundamental principles for teacher education programs and practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.

Knight, P., Tait, N. & Yorke, M. (2006) The professional learning of teachers in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31 (3), 319-339.

Kremer-Hayon, L. & Zuzovsky, R. 1995. Themes, processes and trends in the professional development of teacher educators. In Russell, T., Korthagen, F. (Eds). *Teachers who teach teachers* (155-171). Washington: Falmer Press.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1999) Legitimate peripheral participation in communities of practice, in McCormick, R. and Paechter, C. (Eds.) *Learning and knowledge*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Loughran, J.J. & Berry, A. (2005) Modelling by teacher educators, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21 (2), 193-203.
- Loughran, J.J. (2006) *Developing a Pedagogy of Teacher Education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. London: Routledge.
- Maguire, M. (1994). *The Job of Educating Teachers*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Kings College, University of London.
- Mathias, H. (2005) Mentoring on a Programme for New University Teachers: A partnership in revitalizing and empowering collegiality. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 10 (2), 95-106.
- McNiff, J. & Whitehead, J. (2002) (2nd Ed.) *Action Research: Principles and Practice*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Murray, J. (2002) Between the Chalkface and the Ivory Towers? A study of the professionalism of teacher educators working on primary Initial Teacher Education courses in the English education system. *Collected Original Resources in Education (CORE)* 26 (3), 1-530.
- Murray, J. (2005a) Re-addressing the Priorities: new teacher educators' experiences of induction into Higher Education. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 28 (1), 67-85.
- Murray, J. (2005b) *Investigating Good Practices in the Induction of Teacher Educators into Higher Education*. ESCalate.
- Murray, J. & Male, T. (2005) Becoming a teacher educator: evidence from the field, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21 (2), 25-142.
- Murray, J. (2007) Countering insularity in teacher education. Academic work on pre-service courses in nursing, social work and teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching* 33.3 (August 2007 publication).
- NCIHE (1997) (National Committee of Inquiry in to Higher Education - The 'Dearing Report') Available at www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/ncihe [Accessed October 2006].
- Nonaka, I. & Takeuchi, H. (1995) *The knowledge-Creating Company: how Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quinlan, K.M. (1999) Enhancing Mentoring and Networking of Junior Academic women: what, why and how? *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 21 (1), 31-42.
- Schwiebert, V.L. with Chang, C.Y., Deck, M.D., Smith, J.W. & Woodyard, C. (2000) *Mentoring: Creating Connected, Empowering Relationships*. Alexandria: American Counselling Association.
- Sinkinson, A. (1997). Teachers into Lecturers: an agenda for change. *Teacher Development*. 1 (1), 97-104.

Staniforth, D. & Harland, T. (2006) Contrasting Views of Induction: the experiences of new academic staff and their heads of department. *Active learning in higher education*, 7 (2), 185-196.

Tenner, E. (2004) The Pitfalls of Academic Mentorships. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50 (49) B7-B10.

Trowler, P. & Knight, P.T. (2000) 'Coming to Know in Higher Education: theorising faculty entry to new work contexts', *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19 (1), 27-42.

Warren, E.S. (2005) Future Colleague or Convenient Friend: the Ethics of Mentorship. *Counselling and Values*, 49, 141-146.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of practice: learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. & Snyder, W.M. (2002) *Cultivating communities of practice*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

GUIDELINES

Becoming a Teacher Educator.

Guidelines for the induction of newly appointed lecturers in Initial Teacher Education

ISBN: 978-1-905788-34-7
Spring 2007

Please contact us at:

ESCalate

University of Bristol

Graduate School of Education

35 Berkeley Square

Bristol, BS8 1JA

Tel: +44 (0)117 331 4291

Fax: +44 (0)117 925 1537

Email: heacademy-escalate@bristol.ac.uk

ESCalate@Bristol

We have a continuing policy of responding to consultation and advice. We invite you to participate in shaping ESCalate's future direction and activity.

ESCalate@St Martin's

Centre for the Development

of Learning and Teaching

St Martin's College, Lancaster

LA1 3JD, UK

Tel: +44(0)1524 385 459

Email: escalate@ucsm.ac.uk

ESCalate@Stirling

University of Stirling

DAICE - Institute of Education

Airthrey Castle, Stirling

FK9 4LA, UK

Tel: +44(0)1786 467942/49

Email: escalate@stir.ac.uk